

REMARKS

The Examiner still has not indicated whether the drawings filed with the application on March 26, 2001, have been accepted. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge such an acceptance.

In the present Amendment, Claims 1 to 6 have been amended to recite an optical film laminate. This amendment is supported, for example, by the claims presented in the Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed April 2, 2003.

No new matter has been added, and thus entry of the Amendment is respectfully submitted to be proper. Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1 to 6 will be all the claims pending in the application.

In the Restriction Requirements dated October 15, 2003, it was indicated that Claim 1-6 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

In response, Applicants have in the Amendment, amended Claims 1-6 to recite an optical film laminate, as originally presented.

In Paragraph No. 4 of the Office Action dated June 6, 2003, Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the meaning of the phrase “removal ... by air blowing” in Claim 1 is reasonably clear, which means that excess powders are blown off by the means of blowing air. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the §112 rejection.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/816,342

In Paragraph No. 5 of the Office Action, Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Laurent (US 4,346,189), individually or in view of JP 200258628 A.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-6 as amended are not obvious over Laurent, individually or in view of JP '628 for the reasons as follows.

Laurent does not disclose or suggest the use of non-tacky powders having the particular specific gravity value presently claimed for an optical film laminate, much less appreciate that particular advantages could be obtained upon the use of such a material.

On the other hand, the specification of the present application teaches and appreciates the advantages of adhering non-tacky powders having a specific gravity as presently claimed to edge surfaces of the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer of an optical film laminate including an optical film layer and a pressure sensitive adhesive layer. As is clear from Table 1 of the present specification, a material having a specific gravity outside the range presently claimed was poor in its air blowing suitability.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/816,342

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 14, 2003